MEETING AGENDA

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)
DATE: MARCH 15, 2005
TIME: 8:30 A.M. TO 11:00 P. M.
LOCATION: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, **CONFERENCE ROOM 7A, DOA 7TH FLOOR**

WEAT Members:

- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect – Patricia Carlson (DET representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Keith Hazelton (UW representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Mickey Crittenden (Rock Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Diane Kohn (DWD, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Judy Heil (DATCP, small state agency representative)

DET Governance:

- Michelle Eldridge (DET Governance Staff)

DET Development and Operations:

- Phil Schwarz (DET Operations Representative)
- Allen Poppe (DET Development Representative)

DET Infrastructure and Networks:

- Erik Mickelson (DET Infrastructure and Networks)

Shared Information Services Initiative (SIS):

- Kevin Acker (SIS Technical Lead)

Guests:

- Kenneth Parsons, Michael Bohn, and John Laedlein (DNR WLIS Representatives)

Agenda Items:

1. WEAT, SIS, and Enterprise Updates (30 Min)
2. WEAT – WLIS Review (begins at 9:00 AM)

Assumptions
Based upon the Wisconsin Enterprise Architecture Team's (WEAT) review of the Wisconsin Land Information System (WLIS) documents provided by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) the following assumptions (listed below) have been made by WEAT regarding the overarching application architecture of WLIS:

1. A federated approach was selected to address the "silo" nature of land information records within the State.

2. There was a concern of the State imposing a centralized authority regarding land information records. Therefore a decision to implement distributed architecture for WLIS was made to address these concerns. This decision was made by a technical team commissioned or formed by the Wisconsin Land Information Council and the Wisconsin Land Information Board.

In the past two years the landscape of government has changed significantly, and some of the architectural decisions that were made for WLIS may no longer be valid. The clarifications and questions listed below are intended to provide WEAT with additional information, context, and an understanding of the architecture and architecture decisions that were made for WLIS.

Clarifications
WEAT would like clarification as to why there was a distinct decision *not* to phase the development of WLIS. For example, WLIS could have been phased in to three steps, providing a less complicated approach to developing and implementing WLIS. It is not apparent from the documentation how or who made the decision regarding the approach to developing WLIS.

The WLIS documentation states that both Active Server Page (Microsoft web) and Java Server Page (J2EE) technology are used to provide the presentation layer access to the WLIS Data Management System and the DNR Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Repository Data Management System. WEAT would like clarification *if* the existing combination of J2EE and Microsoft web technologies was due to the ESRI product suite, or for some other reason, such as skill sets of available staff.

Questions
1. Who was the intended audience, stakeholder, or consumer of the WLIS application and/or information provided by WLIS? Please limit your response to the top 3 in this category and for each provide the level of information technology proficiency.

2. What were the requirements for the following "roles" within WLIS? Specifically, list any standards, guidelines, industry best practices if these are relevant:
- Information Consumer or Client
- Information Editor
- Information Provider

3. Once the requirements for the WLIS roles were determined, did DNR propose any focus groups or round table discussions with stakeholders who would be envisioned participating in these roles in the scope of WLIS?

4. Was the use of the state's eBusiness directory environment for authentication considered in the technical design? Were there any challenges, design issues or other problems encountered which precluded or prevented the use of the state's eBusiness directory for this application? Could WLIS be integrated with the new web authentication/authorization environment now being deployed? If not, what are the hurdles that must be addressed for this to occur?

5. What is different about the WLIS Dataman implementation from the Federal Geospatial One Stop implementation? The supporting documentation notes, that both WLIS Dataman and the Federal Geospatial One Stop use a similar conceptual architecture or approach. Did DNR technical staff consult with the developers of the Federal Geospatial One Stop in the initial architectural design phase to discuss approaches?

6. Based upon the experiences DNR encountered with developing the metadata for WLIS, does DNR recommend a course of action to integrate the WLIS Land Information metadata with the larger corpus of metadata in the state agencies and the larger extended enterprise?

7. Why has DNR been unable to resolve issues with the WLIS Metadata Explorer not working after a migration of operating system for the Oracle database management system? Specifically:
- Is there an issue with multiple vendors and the difficulties that can arise in this type "problem resolution" scenario?
- Is there some proprietary interface that is causing this difficulty?
- Is there a lack of resources at DNR to resolve this issue?

8. Was there any thought given to the technological and financial implications for local units of government to participate as a node in the proposed WLIS geography network architecture?

9. What architectural challenges or problems are foreseen that must be addressed to move the system from its current state to completion?

10. If DNR was presented with the same business and technical requirements today, would the same architecture be proposed for WLIS? Specifically, are there elements of the design which the DNR team would suggest be changed, either in overall architecture, overall technical architecture, or specific technical implementations, in order to take advantage of developments since the project began?